UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,630	08/28/2001	Andrew P. Alegria	10015018-1	4533

7590 06/01/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, LE V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/939,630	ALEGRIA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Le Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 4/12/05.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 14 are independent and newly amended.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg") in view of Robertson et al. ("Robertson"), and further in view of Monahan et al. ("Monahan").

As per claim 1, Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI, the method comprising identifying a plurality of links, wherein the identifying is performed in response to an initiation command (fig. 12; col. 25, line 21 through col. 26, line 15; col. 21, lines 6-44), graphically selecting a subset or group of the plurality of links via the graphical user interface (fig. 3; col. 10, lines 29-45), editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links (figs. 3 and 21; col. 10, lines 29-45; col. 31, lines 25-63) and automatically processing the plurality of links, with each link being processed individually (fig. 21; col. 25, line 21 through col. 26, line 15; col. 10, lines 29-39; col. 31, lines 25-63; *wherein described is a step between receiving data/ input and producing results/output and wherein a browser may be generated for each link of the*

list of links and list of links may be compared). Weinberg does not explicitly disclose selecting a subset or group of the plurality of links by an end user so that the graphically selected subset or group of links is automatically processed, with each link being processed individually and, thereby, enabling users to select multiple links in fewer actions by not having to select links individually. Robertson teaches identifying a plurality of links (col. 7, lines 17-32; *relative links are gathered upon users' selection of a Web page/subset such as a home page of a Web site comprising a plurality of links*), graphically selecting a subset or group of the plurality of links via the graphical user interface by an end user (fig. 15; col. 7, lines 17-32; *users select a Web page/subset such as a home page of a Web site comprising a plurality of links as well as a volume from the library of volumes*), editing the plurality of links (col. 6, lines 8-14) and automatically processing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links, with each link being processed individually (Abstract; col. 7, lines 17-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Robertson's teaching of selecting a subset or group of the plurality of links by an end user so that the graphically selected subset or group of links is automatically processed, with each link being processed individually, to Weinberg's teaching of automatically processing the plurality of links, with each link being processed individually in order to provide users with a list of related links that is easily transportable.

Weinberg and Robertson still do not explicitly disclose editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links *by the end user*. Monahan teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI, the method comprising graphically selecting a

subset or group of the plurality of links via the graphical user interface by an end user and editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links by the end user (figs. 3A-9A, 12A and 13; col. 2, lines 8-16; col. 5, lines 30-49; col. 8, lines 35-41; col. 10, lines 52-55; col. 14, lines 5-8; col. 15, lines 13-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Monahan's teaching of editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links *by the end user* to Weinberg and Robertson's teaching of editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links to enable users to navigate large volumes of information.

As per claim 2, the modified Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI comprising editing the plurality of links, wherein the editing is based on at least one option (Weinberg: figs. 16-18; col. 17, lines 1-13; *users may edit the list of links to remove links based on the content type of the links wherein content type comprises one of audio, video, file, etc.*).

As per claim 3, the modified Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI wherein the at least one options is selected by a user (Weinberg: col. 17, lines 1-5; col. 27, lines 37-45).

As per claim 4, the modified Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI wherein the identifying comprises reading a source code of a Web page and determining a plurality of links within the Web page based on predefined criteria (Weinberg: figs. 16-18; col. 17, lines 1-13; col. 21, lines 40-57).

As per claim 5, the modified Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI wherein the automatic processing comprises processing the

plurality of links in a batch mode (Weinberg: figs. 12, 16-19 and 21; col. 17, lines 1-13; col. 25, lines 52-63; col. 21, line 6 through col. 22, line 37; *running data sets acquired from users and then providing the results to the users*).

As per claim 6, the modified Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI wherein each of the plurality of links comprises at least one content type, the content type being one or more of image, text, video audio, data and computer code (Weinberg: col. 17, lines 1-13; *content type such as audio, video, file, etc.*).

As per claim 7, the modified Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI comprising specifying the process performed on the plurality of links, wherein the specified process is at least one of downloading, opening, playing, storing and printing (Weinberg: col. 25, line 21 through col. 26, line 15; col. 10, lines 29-39; col. 16, lines 53-67).

As per claim 8, the modified Weinberg teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI wherein specifying the process comprises specifying the process based on the content type (Weinberg: figs. 16-18; col. 17, lines 1-13).

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 7 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg") in view of Monahan et al. ("Monahan").

As per claims 14 and 16, Weinberg teaches a system for improving performance of a GUI, the system comprising a parser, wherein the parser is configured to identify a plurality of links in response to an initiation command (col. 21, lines 31-44), the plurality of links may be edited based on a selected option (figs. 3, 16-18 and 21; col. 7, lines 16-23; col. 10, lines 29-45; col. 17, lines 1-13; col. 22, lines 23-37; col. 31, lines 25-63; *using a graphical pointer such as a mouse, users may select a subset or group of the plurality of links for editing, e.g. adding or deleting a link, wherein the parser is used to provide users with an updated view of the plurality of links and the selected subset upon user's command to update the list of links*) and a thread generator, wherein the thread generator is configured to individually process each of the plurality of links (col. 21, line 6 through col. 22, line 37; col. 25, line 21 through col. 26, line 15). Weinberg does not explicitly disclose a graphical pointer configured to graphically select a subset or group of the plurality of links via the GUI wherein the parser is configured to edit the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links. However, Weinberg teaches a parser configured to process a request based on the selected option (col. 21, lines 31-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include Weinberg's parser, configured to

process a request based on the selected option, to Weinberg's plurality of links being edited based on a selected option in order to provide users with an implementation preference wherein the application breaks data into smaller chunks so that an application can act on the information.

Weinberg does not explicitly disclose editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links *by the end user*. Monahan teaches a method for improving performance of a GUI, the method comprising graphically selecting a subset or group of the plurality of links via the graphical user interface by an end user and editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links by the end user (figs. 3A-9A, 12A and 13; col. 2, lines 8-16; col. 5, lines 30-49; col. 8, lines 35-41; col. 10, lines 52-55; col. 14, lines 5-8; col. 15, lines 13-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Monahan's teaching of editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links *by the end user* to Weinberg and Robertson's teaching of editing the plurality of links and the selected subset or group of links to enable users to navigate large volumes of information.

As per claim 15, the modified Weinberg teaches a system for improving performance of a GUI comprising a user interface configured to provide a selection of one or more options and a selector configured to accept the one or more options, and to forward the one or more options to at least one of the parser and the thread generator (Weinberg: col. 21, lines 31-44; *upon users' initiation/selection of scanning process, the selection request is forwarded to the parser and thread generator*).

As per claim 17, the modified Weinberg teaches a system for improving performance of a GUI wherein the thread generator is further configured to process the plurality of links based on selected options (Weinberg: figs. 16-18; col. 17, lines 1-13).

As per claim 18, the modified Weinberg teaches a system for improving performance of a GUI wherein the parser is further configured to communicate with a browser to access a source code of a Web page and to identify the plurality of links based on the source code (Weinberg: figs. 16-18; col. 17, lines 1-13; col. 21, lines 40-57).

As per claim 19, the modified Weinberg teaches a system for improving performance of a GUI wherein the thread generator is further configured to communicate with a browser and to forward the plurality of links to the browser for processing (Weinberg: figs. 16-18; col. 17, lines 1-13; col. 21, line 6 through col. 22, line 37; col. 10, lines 29-39).

As per claim 20, the modified Weinberg teaches a system for improving performance of a GUI wherein the thread generator is configured to process the plurality of links in a batch mode (Weinberg: figs. 12, 16-19 and 21; col. 17, lines 1-13; col. 25, lines 52-63; col. 21, line 6 through col. 22, line 37).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, except for the following:

Applicant argued the following:

The references should not and cannot be considered together.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, suggestion and motivation to combine is found in the Robertson reference (col. 7, lines 13-21).

Inquires

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
May 21, 2005

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100